



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,470	05/17/2001	Masao Murade	109337	1628
25944	7590	07/18/2003		
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			EXAMINER	PARKER, KENNETH
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/858,470	MURADE, MASAO
	Examiner Kenneth A Parker	Art Unit 2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-7 and 9-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1,2,4,5 and 23-33 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 6,7 and 9-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. **Claims 6-7 and 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujihara et al, U.S. Patent # 5,771,083, in view of Kouchi et al, U.S. Patent # 5,886,365, Aoki et al, U.S. Patent # 6,177,916, and Sato et al, U.S. Patent # 6,081, 305 as applied above, and further in view of Mizuno et al, US Patent #6266110, Someya et al, US Patent #5,838,399 and Aoki et al, US Patent #5,425,857.**

The secondary references all show the that the use of multiple electrodes for bus lines was notoriously well known for prevention of a voltage drop, and obvious for that reason.

All references show electrode with a high and low resistance, and where the electrodes have substantially the same shape as each other.

2. **Claims 6-7 and 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagaki et al, U.S. Patent # 6,104,370, view of Kouchi et al, U.S. Patent # 5,886,365, Aoki et al, U.S. Patent # 6,177,916, and Sato et al, U.S. Patent # 6,081,305305 as applied above, and further in view of Mizuno et al, US Patent #6266110, Someya et al, US Patent #5,838,399 and Aoki et al, US Patent #5,425,857.**

The secondary references all show the that the use of multiple electrodes for bus lines was notoriously well known for prevention of a voltage drop, and obvious for that reason.

All references show electrode with a high and low resistance, and where the electrodes have substantially the same shape as each other.

3. Claims 6-7 and 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moon, U.S. Patent # 6,133, 967 in view of Kouchi et al, U.S. Patent # 5,886,365, Aoki et al, U.S. Patent # 6,177,916, and Sato et al, U.S. Patent # 6,081,305305 as applied above, and further in view of Mizuno et al, US Patent #6266110, Someya et al, US Patent #5,838,399 and Aoki et al, US Patent #5,425,857.

The secondary references all show the that the use of multiple electrodes for bus lines was notoriously well known for prevention of a voltage drop, and obvious for that reason.

All references show electrode with a high and low resistance, and where the electrodes have substantially the same shape as each other.

4. Claims 6-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kouchi et al, U.S. Patent # 5,886,365, Aoki et al, U.S. Patent # 6,177,916, or Sato et al, U.S. Patent # 6,081,305305 in view of Mizuno et al, US Patent #6266110, Someya et al, US Patent #5,838,399 and Aoki et al, US Patent #5,425,857.

The secondary references all show the that the use of multiple electrodes for bus lines was notoriously well known for prevention of a voltage drop, and obvious in any of the primary references for that reason.

All references show electrode with a high and low resistance, and where the electrodes have substantially the same shape as each other, also showing that these features were conventional. It is also noted that which electrode layer is called which layer can be arbitrarily construed (so long as there are sufficient layers, which each of

the references does have), and that where in the circuit the electrodes are is not specified, so anywhere will do.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 23-33 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are not found persuasive. The examiners positions was that the use of the claimed electrode structure multilayer lead was obvious. As a multilayer lead can be considered two leads "in parallel with respect to both ends", in other words, two parallel lines from the point of connection, thereby meeting the claims as modified.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In particular the Yamazaki references appear to read on the claimed invention.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 2871

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenneth A Parker whose telephone number is 703-305-6202. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William L. Sikes can be reached on 308-4842. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-7722 for regular communications and 703-308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-0956.

Kenneth A Parker
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2871

July 14, 2003